

VERMONT TELEGRAPH.

"I AM SET FOR THE DEFENCE OF THE GOSPEL."

O. S. MURRAY, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

BRANDON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 12, 1836.

VOL. IX.—NO. 3.

TERMS.

The VERMONT TELEGRAPH is published weekly, at \$2.00 a year, payable within four months—after four months and within eight months—after eight months and within the year \$2.50—after the close of the year, to rise in this ratio.

To companies who receive twelve or more copies in one bundle, and pay within four months, at \$1.50—after four months, to rise as above, \$1.75 within eight months &c.

Agents, who procure and pay for six subscribers, are entitled to the seventh copy gratis.

No paper to be discontinued until arrears are paid, except at the discretion of the publisher.

All letters, to secure attention, must come postage paid.

EDUCATION.

Further Extracts from Weld's Report on Manual Labor.

[We give but a moiety of the proof which Mr. Weld has collected and arranged under the different heads. His treatment of the subject discloses great research.]

1. THE PRESENT SYSTEM OF EDUCATION MAKES FEARFUL HAVOC OF HEALTH AND LIFE.

If this position is deemed untenable, the following testimony will sufficiently fortify it:

"The waste of health, and strength, and life, which is daily going on among the youth of talent and high promise in every part of our land, is enough to make any intelligent observer weep."—*Rev. Dr. Miller, Princeton Theol. Sem.*

"Youth, at most public seminaries are liable to become so effeminate, as to be rendered, without some subsequent change of habit, utterly unfit for any manly enterprise or employment. How frequently, too, do they fall victims to this ill limited system of tenderness and seclusion."—*President Lindsley's Inaugural Address.*

"My experience as a student, and also as an instructor, has long since convinced me that at least nine out of ten, among diligent, industrious students, have, in a greater or less degree, suffered the loss of health, by intense application to study, and a want of proper exercise. When I look over the catalogues of those institutions with which, as a student and an instructor, I have been acquainted, and collect together all those whose talents and application once promised extensive usefulness to the church and the world, my spirit mourns, my heart bleeds in contemplating the painful certainty that so large a proportion have either already fallen victims to a mistaken regimen, or only live to drag out a miserable existence, and admonish the world to profit by their mournful example. In short, I cannot but consider a literary institution, which makes no provision for the regular exercise of its students, no better than a manufactory of invalids, and the slaughter-house of cultivated talent."—*President Cassill, Cumberland College, Ky.*

"The neglect of exercise has been the ruin of thousands of literary men, and has deprived our country of some of its richest ornaments."—*Professor Sewall, Medical College, Washington, D. C.*

"I have never made an estimate of the proportion of close students, who go through an entire course of study, without injury to their health in a greater or less degree. They are very few, I am sure; and I am not certain that I could name a single exception."—*Rev. Dr. Green, Philadelphia.*

"My opinion is, that not a solitary individual of the above description [close students, who go through a thorough course] can be found, whose health is not impaired in some degree."—*President Chaplin, Waterville College.*

"For those who have not felt the sad evidence of this in years of debility, it is sufficient to point to the numbers of literary men, who are annually obliged to abandon their pursuits, either partially or entirely, because the body is incapable of sustaining the mind in its efforts. They need only observe the multitudes of others, who with ample intellectual preparations maintain with difficulty an artificial and painful existence, and whose physical debility prevents them from exploring depths of science, and soaring to heights of speculation, which they feel to be within their grasp, but pant in vain to reach."—*Amer. Jour. of Education.*

"So far as my personal observation has extended, I should consider it perfectly safe to say, that three-fourths of our diligent students impair their health by insufficient exercise, and probably it would be nearer the truth to call the proportion nine tenths."—*Rev. Thomas H. Gallaudet, Hartford, Ct.*

"Upwards of three hundred young men have been received in this institution during the above mentioned period [fourteen years]. Eight of these died before they finished their education. Seventeen others left the institution with their health so much impaired that they were obliged to abandon their course, and twenty-seven more materially injured their health by the neglect of regular exercise; while a greater number have sustained a less injury."—*Rev. Dr. Kendrick, Professor, Hamilton Theol. Sem., N. Y.*

"The mischief done by this perverse mode of education is inconceivable. It has been the grand source of bodily inactivity, voluptuous weakness, effeminacy, a multitude of diseases, and in short an immeasurable portion of our sufferings. What then shall we say of a mode of education which forcibly impels us to disobey the laws of nature, by rejecting from its plan the improvement of our bodies with the habits of corporeal exertion, and leaving these important subjects to blind chance."—*Prof. Salzman, Germany.*

Are these competent witnesses? Is their testimony worthy of credit? Are these explicit statements mere blind guess work, or are they the records of undeniable fact? Are they ghostly spectres conjured up to scare children, or giant realities that may well alarm men? The character of the witnesses, their opportunities for observation, the explicit and emphatic language in which they clothe their testimony, and the deep toned earnestness with which it is uttered, will be deemed sufficient vouchers by all whose convictions are produced by evidence.

In view of facts as they are, I ask, "Shall the sword devour for ever?" Shall this havoc be entailed upon the next generation, and accelerated onward, until the world turns pale before a destroyer which every where walketh in darkness, and wasteth at noonday? Shall we, by refusing to arrest the ruin while we can, not only give it free passage down to our children's children, but blasphemously bid God speed to the tragedy which is to drown them in their own blood?

PARENTS' DEPARTMENT.

From the Religious Magazine.

FILIAL AFFECTION.

In nothing is the kindness of our beneficent Creator more apparent than in his institution of the family. Family—touching word! What a host of tender associations cluster in our minds around the simple thought, "my home!" What is it which gives to home this magic power over us? Abroad in the busy world we have honor, emolument, distinction; at home we have love. Even the stern and tearless man cannot subsist upon the conventional and heartless attention, or even the sincere and gratifying respect of the world abroad; his soul yearns for the fond expressions of his wife and little ones; for the assistance, support, and respectful sympathy in all his plans of his older children at home. And of all the charms of home there is none superior in power and beauty to the charm of filial affection. Its influence and operation are as noiseless and unobtrusive as the quiet twilight of a Sabbath eve; but it throws a halo of glory around the family where it is unobstructed. Its power, like that of the religion of Jesus, is pervading. It controls the whole character. To suppose the child full of filial affection to be lacking in fraternal love, is absurd. Filial affection is a mighty principle, inferior, yet like, to love to God. The child reasons under every circumstance, "will my father, will my mother be pleased to have me do thus?" That the parents have trained up their children in the way that they should go, is the supposition here. Its beauty, who can describe! Observe the sympathy which exists between that gentle daughter and her busy father. "Anna," he says, as he goes abroad to the toils of a morning lecture, "Anna, my love, this is the article I wish you to copy to day in your fair hand; my manuscript is such a scrawl, I fear you will be troubled with it." "No fear of that, dearest father; I know your writing well, and shall easily puzzle it out." In the same manner she applies herself day after day, and even copies volumes; lively filial affection fostered by a father's smile making that a pleasure which is really a laborious task, and which to another would be irksome and disgusting.

Does such filial affection exist in all families? The very question is distressing; but yet it must be met, since this, followed by the inquiry, why not? is the very object of this paper. The first inquiry our reader's experience will have answered. We pass to the other. We shall not stay to prove the obligation of children to love their parents. That God hath commanded it is enough. But the duty is self-evident. One would think that God enjoined it in the Decalogue, merely that the vilest might be without excuse, and know and be assured that obedience here was not a matter of indifference but of explicit command. Our subject considered at length would be far too comprehensive for the limits of a single paper. We shall therefore pass the case of those families where God is not acknowledged. For if you love not God, to whom you stand indebted for your all, think you the sagacious precepts to your children, will countervail this glaring practical lesson of disobedience? Can you, who quietly resist the so much greater obligation, with much confidence expect your offspring to recognize the loss. Nor did we propose to consider the duty of filial obedience any farther than it is inseparable from filial love. The inquiry which particularly attracts our attention is, why is it that in some Christian families, where the children have been trained up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; have been converted if you please, and even attribute their conversion to the faithful efforts of their parents; where they entertain a high respect for the endowments of their parents, and for their standing in society, there should yet be comparatively little filial love? Is it that these parents have taken less pains, made less effort, expen-

ded less money? On the contrary, it will be often found that they have done more in each of these ways than some whose children almost worship them. Is not this quite unaccountable? Not at all. Look around you in the world; suppose yourself for a moment without a friend; in this attitude you commence the work of choosing all your friends anew. Suppose all favorably disposed towards you. Would the most wealthy, the most honorable, the most laborious spirits inevitably secure your warmest love? We may refer you for the elucidation of our sentiments to the chapter on friends in the "Young Christian," and particularly to the story of the sailor boy, (p. 33) as an opposite illustration. "But," say some parents, "my children have had too many substantial proofs of my affection to doubt my love. And though I do not sympathize with them in the paltry concerns which occupy so much of their attention, they ought to love me. But Oh! my heart is pained to perceive a want of filial affection and confidence in me." How do you know that there is any want of filial affection and confidence in you? Do they not obey your commands? Are they not governed by the principles you have instilled into their minds? Do they not speak respectfully of you to the world? "Why, yes, I cannot say but in these particulars, and in matters of such general importance, they do as well as other children. But is this all the filial affection I am to look for in my children?" That depends upon circumstances. You have been wont to rule your household with gentle firmness. Suppose you exchange this for greater severity, and rule them with a rod of iron. We do not mean with injustice, but with inflexible determination. Probably few will think this suited to augment filial affection, though it might secure implicit and more perfect obedience. Suppose you become less strict with them than you have ever been before. Methinks we hear you say, "that I can never do—I have never refused them any reasonable indulgence, nor withheld anything in the power of my hand to furnish, if suited to their good. This they know, and I have confidence in them that they appreciate my motives. To pursue such a course, therefore, would tend only to diminish their respect." Your remark is undoubtedly just; for even young children have sense enough to know that weak compliance with their unreasonable demands, is the result of imbecility and indecision, not of parental affection. It would seem then that you are not satisfied with the "substantial proofs" you have of their filial affection, in their general obedience to your commands. You would have them not only fly to execute all your commands, which they might do without a particle of love, but leave you with reluctance in the morning, welcome you at noon, watch your return with sparkling eyes at night; in short you desire open, manifest, lively expressions of confidence and delight in you. Did it ever occur to you that "love begets love"? That lively love subsists not upon "substantial proof," that come like angel's visions, comparatively, few and far between. How often does a single word pronounced with the gentle accent of affection swell the breast with a full tide of love. "The very constitution of man praises God," we quote from above. God is infinitely wise. Had he been less so he might have given to favors a value proportioned to the expense incurred. Blessed be the Lord our God who is wise above all Gods. He seeth not as man seeth. The soul meanest in man's apprehension, may stand highest in his; and often our souls exult in loving those who have never bestowed upon us the slightest favor, but whose gentle and winning manner, reflecting the spirit of Christ, wins its way irresistibly to our souls, securing our love without a bribe.

The inference is easy. Would you have the lively affection and confidence of your children, you must sympathize with them in all their little cares. Study their predilections and their prejudices. Be actually interested in their objects of pursuit. How certainly do the affections of the little creatures become alienated or deadened, whose parents listen to their childish cares with forced attention. Deal gently as well as firmly with them. Let there be love in the very tones of your voice. Always rule your own spirit. Beware of the very existence of an idea that father or mother can ever be found in such a spirit, that the little one who comes running to them may meet an angry reception. Take heed that they see nothing in the family which would sink your dignity in the estimation of a stranger. Whom they cannot respect they will soon cease to love. Young children have almost intuitive perceptions of what is right and wrong. Does father come home to dinner in a peevish mood—or only taciturn? does he invoke a blessing accompanied with a solemn ascription of thanks to the bountiful Creator, and the next breath (his piety having vanished with the dish-cover) fret at Mrs. A. because the joint of meat has been boiled which he thought to have had roasted? or regardless of the courtesies he would not dare to withhold from a stranger, does he devour his dinner with an absent mind? Where is the little child so dull as not to notice this? And where is the conscientious older child of such a parent, who is not compelled to struggle with the revulsion of feeling ex-

hibited by these and kindred exhibitions? True, every child should, and every affectionate child will be as blind as possible to a parent's faults. But who would wish to presume on this, knowing that these things are they which do and will influence the affections of the young mind beyond calculation. A child knows that pride of character, pride of personal and family appearance, are motives sufficient to impel a parent to procure every expensive advantage for him. Proof of his parent's love deduced from the passion of such things is therefore inconclusive. A hundred little kindnesses, not valued at a pin, rightly bestowed, outweigh them all. Expensive favors, when ascertained logically, beyond a doubt to spring from affection, if unaccompanied by the gentle voice and tender glance excite pain rather than pleasure.

In conclusion, we can scarcely conceive of anything more infelicitous than a parent's reproaching his children with lack of filial affection. Perhaps they may be thus wanting; perhaps not. If not, is not this the most direct way to render them so? and if partially guilty, to increase the evil? Is it not rather wise when we begin to spy symptoms of an unfilial spirit, to redouble our affectionate attentions, gently point out the things that should not be, and lift a fervent cry to God. Those who are attempting this, we would bid God speed. Abound in affectionate love to all mankind, and God will help you and reward you, not only with his peace which passeth understanding, and with the affection of your sons and daughters, but also with the love of all who come within the circle of your influence.

DISCIPLUS.

ANTI-ROMANISM.

From the American Protestant Vindicator.

CANADIAN CONTROVERSY.

Mr. Jones, the editor of the "L'Ami du Peuple," a newspaper published in Montreal, Lower Canada, having challenged the Protestants of New York to a written controversy, respecting the subjects contained in Maria Monk's "Awful Disclosures," conditioned that every article so designated by them, should be translated into French by him, and be published in his journal, "L'Ami du Peuple,"—and that all the essays upon the same topic, or replies which he may promulge in French, shall be translated into English, and be published in the American Protestant Vindicator; and that after having been accepted on our part—we therefore commence a series of papers expressly for that purpose, under the general name of "Romanism in Canada;" and that comprehensive title has been assumed, that neither of the parties may be restricted from advancing those arguments or adducing that evidence, which any of the disputants may judge to be relevant to their cause.

ROMANISM IN CANADA.—No. 1.

To the Honorable Sir Jonathan Sewall, Chief Justice of Lower Canada.

You are already apprised that in the month of May, 1835, a young woman in an advanced state of pregnancy, was discovered in a forlorn and wretched situation in the suburbs of the city of New York. By the kind interposition of a citizen named Hilliker, and others, she was removed to one of the public benevolent institutions. During her stay in that house, waiting to pass through the hour of nature's trial, a Roman priest of New York named Conroy, frequently endeavored to have access to her. To the attendants upon the house, he represented that the female referred to was an eloped nun from the Hotel Dieu Convent, Montreal; and that he was amply empowered to obtain possession of her, and would have her at all risks; that he might transfer her back again to the surveillance of that institution.

You are also aware, that during her confinement, and when it was supposed she was about to pass from time into eternity, to "stand before the judgment seat of Christ," and to "give account of herself to God," to relieve her manifestly agonized soul, she revealed to the Rev. Mr. Tappan, the chaplain of the house, that her name was Maria Monk, the daughter of a deceased British military officer; that she had been a nun in the Hotel Dieu Convent at Montreal; that she had there witnessed the most unnatural and revolting licentiousness, combined with rapes, infanticides, and other murders; and that the child of which she was the mother, was the offspring of a Roman priest of Montreal, named Phelan!

You are likewise acquainted with the fact, that almost immediately after her unexpected restoration to health and strength, Maria Monk visited Montreal, there publicly charged upon Father Phelan, the paternity of her infant; there constantly reiterated the criminal allegations against the Roman prelate Lartigue, and many of the inferior priests in his diocese—that she formally attested to the truth of her statements upon oath—that she had an interview with Mr. Ogden, the Attorney General of Lower Canada, and Mr. Grant, one of the King's counsel, in the presence of two Roman priests—and that Messrs. Ogden and Grant, instead of acting according as their duty required, in the case submitted to them, preferred to Maria Monk a bribe of a life annuity, provided she would reside in Canada, and

place herself under their protection, and be silent altogether respecting the affairs of the Nunneries and the Roman priest of Canada.

You have also heard of, or more probably seen, the volume that Maria Monk published, after endeavoring in vain during four weeks, to procure a personal meeting with the priests and nuns of Montreal. Her forlorn and dependent situation after her return to New York, attracted the sympathy of Christian benevolence. Her statements were critically examined—her narrative was most minutely explored and tested—every method which ingenuity could devise was adopted to elicit information upon the topic, by inquiries of citizens of Montreal, and of persons now resident in New York, but who have long been inhabitants of that city—and from the irresistible corroborative evidence which was thus obtained, after the most cautious investigation of all the conflicting statements, and after a protracted scrutiny of the testimony, both oral and written, and especially of the affidavits which were published in Montreal in November 1835, it was deliberately concluded, that the two grand and essential points in this momentous affair were indisputable. That Maria Monk has been a Nun in the Hotel Dieu Convent; and that her delineations of the Priests and Nuns in Canada are graphically correct and undeniable.

You have been further informed without doubt, that almost immediately after Maria Monk returned to New York from Montreal, in September, 1835, her situation was divulged in the Protestant Vindicator, a religious newspaper, issued in New York—that upon the credit given to her Narrative as sustained by separate and collateral evidence, the Roman Prelate and Priests who were directly implicated in her charges of rapes, infanticides and murders, were invited to a meeting, at which the truth of her indictments should be tried; and as a compendious, easy, and decisive method of determining the whole mysterious affair, it was proposed, that the interior of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery should be examined by several impartial, disinterested, and honorable gentlemen, both Protestants and Romanists, who should publish their report of the result, and by whose authentic statements, the credibility of the facts narrated by Maria Monk, or the certainty that she is an impostor, should be definitely established. That offer has been contemptuously disregarded by the Canadian Ecclesiastics during the whole period which has elapsed since the month of October, 1835.

You have also seen it published at different periods, commencing in October 1835, until the month of July 1836, that artificers of various kinds have been employed during that whole interval in making alterations in the premises, in the walls, gates, and avenues of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery Convent, and in the interior of the edifice—which fact is indubitably confirmed not only by the solemn testimony of the neighboring residents of the nunnery, but by the very workmen themselves, who have been employed and paid by the Roman Priests to stop up the subterraneous passage from the Seminary to the Convent; and also in transforming entirely the position of certain rooms, and the course of the passages; so as to make them altogether different from the description given of them by Maria Monk in her volume entitled "Awful Disclosures."

You have likewise understood, that after all the changes and arrangements were completed, the Roman Prelate Lartigue granted permission to Mr. Jones, editor of "L'Ami du Peuple," a newspaper issued at Montreal, to take into the Nunnery with him, under the stipulated plea of examining that institution, four gentlemen of Montreal, all of whom during a year past, have been the most active partisans whom the Romish Priesthood have rendered subservient to their designs, in concealing that "mystery of iniquity and working of Satan," 2 Thes. ii. 7, 9; which Maria Monk has developed. That pretended search amply ratifies the prior published "Awful Disclosures."

A year having now elapsed, and time having been obtained to arrange a tale; to procure supposititious testimony; to compile a systematic series of affidavits; and to impose upon the world a mass of fictions, which it is infallibly certain, did not exist even in imagination, anterior to the appearance Maria Monk's Narrative; the Roman Prelate and Priests of Montreal have delegated two of their subordinate Agents to publish in New York those Jesuitical frauds and forgeries, expressly to turn away public attention from the only true and important questions in the controversy, and to blind the eyes and bewilder the judgment of the inconsiderate and irreligious portion of the American and British people.

I therefore inform you, as holding the exalted and responsible office of the Chief Justice of Lower Canada, that the Christians of Canada, Britain, and the United States cannot be imposed upon by the recent collusive exploration of the Hotel Dieu Nunnery of Montreal; nor will they believe the suspicious and unsupported testimony of Canadians who can neither read nor write; and some of whom, as Mr. Jones did not dare to deny in New

York, had been bribed by himself; and who, by the express command of their Priests, swore to the truth of affidavits which had been prepared for their attestation, and of the contents of which they were profoundly ignorant.

I have the honor to be, Your faithful servant, G. B.

RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

From Chalmers's Works.

The Guilt of Dishonesty not to be estimated by the Gain of it.

"He that is faithful in that which is least, is faithful also in much; and he that is unjust in the least, is unjust also in much."—*Luke xvi. 10.*

[Continued from our last.]

The second reason, why he who is unfaithful in the least has incurred the condemnation of him who is unfaithful in much, is, that the littleness of the gain, so far from giving a littleness to the guilt, is in fact a circumstance of aggravation.—There is just this difference. He who has committed injustice for the sake of a less advantage, has done it on the impulse of a less temptation. He has parted with his honesty at an inferior price; and this circumstance may go so to equalize the estimate, as to bring it very much to one with the deliverance, in the text, to our great Teacher of righteousness. The limitation between good and evil stood as distinctly before the notice of the small as of the great deprecator; and he has just made as direct a contravention to the first reason, when he passed over upon the wrong side of it. And he may have made little of gain by the enterprise, but this does not allay the guilt of it. Nay, by the second reason, this may serve to aggravate the wrath of the divinity against him. It proves how small the price is which he sets upon his eternity, and how cheaply he can bargain the faith of God away from him, and how low he rates the good of an inheritance with him, and for what a trifle he can dispose of all interest in his kingdom and in his promises. The very circumstance which gives to his character a milder transgression in the eyes of the world, makes it more odious in the judgment of the sanctuary. The more paltry it is in respect to profit, the more profane it may be in respect of principle. It likens him the more to profane Esau, who sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. And thus it is, indeed, most awful to think of such a senseless and alienated world; and how heedlessly the men of it are posting their infatuated way to destruction; and how, for as little gain as might serve them a day, they are contracting as much guilt as will ruin them for ever; and are profoundly asleep in the midst of such designs and such doings, as will form the valid materials of their entire and everlasting condemnation.

It is with argument such as this that we would try to strike conviction among a very numerous class of offenders in society—those who, in the various departments of trust, or service, or agency, are ever practising, in little, at the work of secret appropriation—those whose hands are in a state of constant defilement, by the putting of them forth to that which they ought to touch not, and taste not, and handle not—those who silently number such pilferments as can pass unnoticed among the perquisites of their office; and who by an excess in their charges, just so slight as to escape detection—or by a habit of purloining, just so restrained as to elude discovery, have both a conscience very much at ease in their own bosoms, and a credit very fair, and very entire, among their acquaintances around them. They grossly count upon the smallness of their transgression. But they are just going in a small way to hell. They would recoil with violent dislike from the act of a midnight depredator. It is just because terrors, and trials, and executions, have thrown around it the pomp and the circumstance of guilt. But at another bar, and on a day of more dreadful solemnity, their guilt will be made to stand out in its essential characters, and their condemnation will be pronounced from the lips of Him who judgeth righteously. They feel that they have incurred no outrageous forfeiture of character among men, and this instils a treacherous complacency into their own hearts. But the piercing eye of Him who looketh down from heaven is upon the reality of the question; and He who ponders the secrets of every bosom, can perceive, that the man who recoils only from such a degree of injustice as is notorious, may have no justice whatever in his character. He may have a sense of reputation. He may have the fear of detection and disgrace. He may feel a revolt in his constitution against the magnitude of a gross and glaring violation. He may even share in all the feelings and principles of that conventional kind of morality which obtains in his neighborhood. But, of that principle which is surrendered by the least act of unfaithfulness, he has no share whatever. He perceives no overruling sacredness in that boundary which separates the right from the wrong. If he only keep decently near, it is a matter of indifference to him whether he be on this or on that side of it. He can be unfaithful in that which is least. There may be other principles, and other considerations to restrain him; but certain it is, that it is now the principle of justice which